

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated June 4, 2010 (the Action). Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,358,960 to Mak (Mak) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2009/0156178 to Elsey (Elsy).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify that a telecommunications device is a mobile telecommunications device, and the list is displayed on the display of the mobile telecommunications device. The independent claims have been further amended to recite that when the default number or address is a default number, the further numbers or addresses are one or more numbers, and when the default number or address is a default address, the further numbers or addresses are one or more addresses. Support for the above amendments may be found, for example, in Figures 1-11 and on page 10, lines 6-29 and page 12, lines 4-15 of the current application. Applicants submit that the above amendments do not add new matter, introduce new issues or require a new search. Accordingly, entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

#### **I. Claim Objections**

Claims 4 and 9 are amended above to correct claim dependencies as required on page 4 of the Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to Claims 4 and 9 is respectfully requested.

#### **II. The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 1 as amended recites as follows (emphasis added):

1. A method of selecting a number or address from a list stored in a mobile telecommunications device for initiating a call or sending a message from the mobile telecommunications device to the number or address, the list comprising names and one or more numbers or addresses corresponding to each name, the method comprising:

displaying on a display of the mobile telecommunications device a list comprising at least some of the stored names, one of the names in the list being highlighted;

the highlighted name being displayed in the list on the display of the mobile telecommunications device together with a default one of the one or more numbers and/or addresses corresponding to the high-lighted name; and

displaying on the display of the mobile telecommunications device together with the default number or address an indication of whether the list comprises further numbers or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name in addition to the displayed number or address, wherein when the default number or address is a default number, the further numbers or addresses are one or more numbers, and when the default number or address is a default address, the further numbers or addresses are one or more addresses.

The Action takes the position that certain features discussed in Applicants' paper filed March 8, 2010, such as the size constraints of a mobile terminal, are not recited in the claims. *See* the Action, page 3. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the independent Claims 1 and 6 to recite that the telecommunications device is a mobile telecommunications device.

As discussed in Applicants' paper filed March 8, 2010 and conceded on page 5 of the Action, Mak does not disclose displaying together with a default number or a default address an indication of whether the corresponding list comprises further numbers or addresses corresponding to the highlighted name in addition to the displayed number or address. The Action takes the position that this recitation is disclosed Elsey. However, Elsey relates to information/call centers in which the operator must relay information displayed on a monitor to a user. An operator in Elsey may view the information for a user when the user is calling the operator in order to have the corresponding information when the user is not able to access the information on the user's communication device. *See* paragraphs [0045] and [0065] of Elsey. In Elsey, information is always displayed only on a terminal of an operator and not on a display of the mobile telecommunications device such as a mobile phone. Consequently, Mak, which relates to mobile phone displays, and Elsey, which relates to an operator terminal in an information/call center, are not in a similar field of endeavor as maintained on page 6 of the Action. Accordingly, there is no motivation or reason to

combine Mak and Elsey with any reasonable expectation of success because Elsey relates to displaying information on a standard terminal used by an operator and is not concerned with the size constraints of the mobile terminal. It is further noted that, due to the size constraints of the mobile terminal, the information displayed in Elsey cannot be displayed on the display of the mobile telecommunications device.

In contrast, as recited in Claims 1 and 6, the information is displayed on the display of a mobile telecommunications device, and consequently, the information is displayed directly to a user of the mobile telecommunications device. Elsey does not disclose displaying any information, such as telephone numbers or e-mail addresses, etc., to the user of a telecommunications device that is establishing a call. Instead, according to Elsey, the contact information is displayed on an operator terminal and needs to be communicated to the remote user by the operator. Accordingly, even if the disclosures of Mak and Elsey were combined, it would still not be possible for one of skill in the art to achieve the subject matter of independent Claims 1 and 6 without impermissible hindsight.

In addition, Claims 1 and 6 recite that when the default number or address is a default number, the further numbers or addresses are one or more numbers, and when the default number or address is a default address, the further numbers or addresses are one or more addresses. In contrast, in Elsey, the additional information provided appears different from that already displayed and relates to a postal or electronic mail address, for example, as discussed in paragraph [0063] of Elsey. This recitation is also not disclosed or rendered obvious by Mak.


Applicants submit that the recitations of independent Claims 1 and 2 are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Mak or Elsey. Claims 3-5 and 8-18 are patentable at least by virtue of the claims from which they depend. Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In re: Per Ogren  
Application No.: 10/580,592  
Filed: January 19, 2007  
Page 9 of 9

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and the same is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 919-854-1400 for resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura M. Kelley  
Registration No. 48,441

**USPTO Customer No. 20792**  
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec  
Post Office Box 37428  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627  
Telephone: 919/854-1400  
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

### CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on August 4, 2010.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Joyce Paoli